



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,508	08/16/2000	Richard S. Chomik	460.1891USV	3194

7590 08/19/2002

Charles N.J. Ruggiero Esq
OHLANDT GREELEY RUGGIERO & PERLE LLP
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3724	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/639,508	Applicant(s) Chomik et al.
Examiner Clark F. Dexter	Art Unit 3724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Andrew Gust

(3) Mr. Clark Dexter

(2) Mr. Charles Ruggiero

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 16, 2002

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 14

Identification of prior art discussed:

Greenwood et al., pn 5,499,729

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Regarding the "112" issues, Applicant's position is that the perforations of the present invention clearly have at least two diameters; first, the elongated slit 18 is directed to a preferred embodiment, and that the apertures referred to in the specification (e.g., see p. 6, lines 4-10) could be circular thus providing one of the diameters, while the depression 20 provides at least a second diameter; second, the disclosed depression itself, particularly as shown in the drawings, provides at least two diameters. Regarding the prior art rejection, applicant's position is that Greenwood does not teach or suggest perforations wherein a centerline of each perforation is coincident with a respective radius of the domed portion. Mr. Dexter's position is that the claim is not limited to such a configuration and maintains his position expressed in the Final rejection (paper no. 12). Mr. Gust and Mr. Ruggiero stated that the claims would be amended to further define the claimed invention. Mr. Dexter stated that such an amendment would likely require further consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3724



Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.